



03-21-01

#18  
1652  
Dmt  
3-28-01

146.1335

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: :  
JESUS CORTES et al : M. Rao  
Serial No.: 463,705 :  
Filed: January 25, 2000 : Group: 1652  
For: BIOSYNTHESIS...AND THEIR USE :

600 Third Avenue  
New York N.Y. 10016  
March 20, 2001

RESPONSE

Asst. Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Responsive to the office action of January 25, 2001,  
Applicants request reconsideration of the application in view of  
the remarks presented herein.

The claims in the application are claims 2 to 16 and 20 to 45,  
all other claims having been cancelled.

The Examiner has required a ten-way restriction requirement as  
set forth in the office action and has gone on to require an  
election of species. Supposedly, there was a seven-way election of  
species requirement. However, groups IV and V were not set forth  
in the office action.

Applicants vigorously traverse the restriction requirement and  
the election of species requirement. Applicants believe that there  
is but a single invention in the present application and fall  
within the scope of claim 1 or the use thereof and it is deemed

EL 98303981 45  
MARCH 29 2001  
I hereby certify that this paper or fee is  
being deposited with the United States Postal  
Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee"  
under 39 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated  
above, and is addressed to the Commissioner  
of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C.

March 20 2001  
D. Valconcey  
Signature of person mailing paper or fee

TECH CENTER 1600/2000

MAR 23 2001


RECEIVED

that the same fall under the single generic concept in accordance with PCT Rule 13.1 and therefore, it is requested that all of claims be examined in the present application. In order to be fully responsive to the office action, Applicants elect with traverse the claims of group I which include claims 1 to 15, 42 and 43. However, the Examiner is requested to reconsider the restriction requirement and to examine all of the claims.

With respect to the election of species requirement, Applicants traverse this requirement as well since it is not deemed that the species are patentably distinct. However, in accordance with the Examiner's requirement, Applicants elect with a vigorous traverse the species of group I which, according to the Examiner, includes claims 1, 2 and 5.

Since the first office action was merely a restriction requirement, Applicants request a prompt examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,  
Bierman, Muserlian and Lucas

By:   
Charles A. Muserlian #19,683  
Attorney for Applicants  
Tel.# (212) 661-8000

CAM:ds  
Enclosures